

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 7-9 and 21-27 are pending in the present application. Claims 7-9, 21-23 and 25 have been amended, and Claims 1-5, 10-15, 17-20 and 29 have been cancelled, herewith. Reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

Applicants have amended Claims 7-9, 21-23 and 25, and cancelled Claims 1-5, 10-15, 17-20 and 29 from further consideration in this application. Applicants are not conceding in this application that these claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as the present claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of the allowable subject matter noted by the examiner. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue these and other claims in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications.

### **I. Claim Objection**

The Examiner objected to Claim 7, due to Claim 9 reciting "export generation code". Applicants have amended Claim 9 to eliminate this cited language ("export generation code").

### **II. 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph**

The Examiner rejected Claim 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

This rejection is now moot as Claim 29 has been cancelled herewith, without prejudice or disclaimer, as described above.

Therefore, the rejection of Claim 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph has been overcome.

### **III. 35 U.S.C. § 101**

Claims 7-9 and 17-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed towards non-statutory subject matter. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to Claims 17-20, this rejection is now moot as Claims 17-20 have been cancelled herewith, without prejudice or disclaimer, as described above. As to Claim 28, this claim was previously cancelled and is therefore no longer pending.

Regarding Claim 7 (and similarly for dependent Claims 8 and 9) and Claim 21 (and similarly for dependent Claim 22), such claims have been amended to recite that the generated representations are visually presented to a user.

Regarding Claim 23 (and similarly for dependent Claims 24-27), Applicants have amended such claim to recite that the generated representations are stored in a computer memory.

Therefore, the rejection of Claims 7-9 and 17-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 has been overcome.

#### IV. 35 U.S.C. § 103, Obviousness

Claims 1-3, 7, 8, 10-13, 17-19, 21-25 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Brisson (U.S. Patent No. 5,678,052), hereinafter “Brisson” in view of Lämmel et al. (Semi-Automatic Grammar Recovery; available July 2001), hereinafter “Lämmel” and further in view of Collier et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,815,152), hereinafter “Collier”. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to Claims 1-3, 10-13, 17-19 and 29, this rejection is now moot as Claims 1-3, 10-13, 17-19 and 29 have been cancelled herewith, without prejudice or disclaimer, as described above.

With respect to Claim 7 (and similarly for dependent Claim 8), such claim recites “implementing storage and maintenance of a set of features identifiable in graphical business process representations, each feature in the set of features having an associated pattern mapping defined relative to structural text-based representations” and “identifying portions of an initial graphical representation as matching features in the set of features”. As can be seen, per the features of Claim 1, there are a set of features identifiable in graphical business process representations – and each of these features has an associated pattern mapping defined relative to structural text-based representations. As to the use of such pattern mapping, portions of an initial graphical representation are identified as matching features in the set of features. In rejecting the pattern mapping feature aspects of Claim 7, the Examiner asserts that:

“Brisson discloses using pattern mappings to create the RR diagram (see figure 3).”

The Examiner makes no assertion or allegation that any of the cited references teach or otherwise suggest *a set of features that are identifiable in graphical representations*, or that *each feature in the set of features has an associated pattern mapping*. Thus, it is urged that the Examiner has failed to properly establish a prima facie showing of obviousness with such generalized, cursory statement the pattern mappings are *used to create the RR diagram*<sup>1</sup>, as such generalized assertion does not establish a teaching or suggestion with respect to the particular detailed features recited in such claim – and in particular that *each of the graphical representation features* has an

---

<sup>1</sup> In rejecting claims under 35 U.S.C. Section 103, the examiner bears the initial burden of presenting a prima facie case of obviousness. *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 1445, 24 USPQ2d 1443, 1444 (Fed. Cir. 1992). To establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all of the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. MPEP 2143.03. *See also, In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 580 (C.C.P.A. 1974). If the examiner fails to establish a prima facie case, the rejection is improper and will be overturned. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 1074, 5 USPQ2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). In the absence of a proper prima facie case of obviousness, an applicant who complies with the other statutory requirements is entitled to a patent. *See In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 1445, 24 USPQ2d 1443, 1444 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

associated pattern mapping. Thus, it is shown that Claim 7 has been erroneously rejected due to such failure to properly establish a prima facie showing of obviousness.

Further with respect to Claim 7 (and similarly for dependent Claim 8), such claim recites “generating structural text-based representations of the identified portions of the initial graphical representation by applying the pattern mappings associated with the matching features to the identified portions of the graph-based representation”. As can be seen, the generation of the structural *text-based representations* is done by applying the pattern mappings. In rejecting this aspect of Claim 7, the Examiner merely alleges that Bisson ‘discloses using pattern mappings to create the RR diagram (see figure 3)’. The Examiner thus merely alleges a teaching of using pattern mappings to create a *graphical* representation. In contrast, Claim 7 recites just the opposite of what is alleged to be disclosed by Bisson. Per Claim 7 the *text-based representation is generated by applying pattern mapping*, whereas per the alleged *Bisson teachings a graphical (RR diagram) is generated using pattern mapping*. Thus, it is further urged that Claim 7 has been erroneously rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as the Examiner has further failed to properly establish a prima facie showing of obviousness.

Still further with respect to Claim 7, the combined teachings of the cited references does not teach or otherwise suggest two different identifying steps that use different parameters as a part of such identifying operation. Claim 7 expressly recites “identifying portions of an initial graphical representation as matching features in the set of features” and “identifying portions of an initial structural text-based representation of a business process as corresponding to pattern mappings associated with features in the set of features”. As can be seen, portions of an initial *graphical* representation are identified as *matching features* in the set of features, whereas portions of an initial structural *text-based* representation are identified as *corresponding to pattern mappings* associated with features in the set of features. These claimed identifying features advantageously allow for a given pattern mapping to be used bilaterally in *both* the generation of the text representation *as well as* the graphical representation (Specification pages 43-45). None of the cited references contemplate bilateral conversion using a common pattern mapping scheme as provided by the features of Claim 7. Thus, it is further urged that Claim 7 (and similarly for dependent Claim 8) is not obvious in view of the cited references.

Further with respect to Claim 8, such claim recites “the set of identifiable features and the associated pattern mappings, comprises at least five feature and pattern mapping pairs selected from the following set of pairs: i. feature: synchronous/asynchronous processes; pattern mapping: a synchronous process representation comprises a <receive> activity as its input interface, and a <reply> activity as its output interface; an asynchronous process representation comprises a <receive> activity as its input interface, and an <invoke> activity as its output interface; ii. feature: request/response activity; pattern mapping: an <invoke> activity with attributes inputContainer and outputContainer to specify input and

output containers assigned to the activity; iii. feature: one-way activity; pattern mapping: an <invoke> activity, with attribute inputContainer and no outputContainer; iv. feature: empty node; pattern mapping: an <empty> activity defined by a naming convention including node name; v. feature: block; pattern mapping: a <scope> activity with two <empty> activities nested within the <scope> activity to represent the input and output nodes in the block; vi. feature: iteration; pattern mapping: a <while> activity having an attribute condition equivalent to the loop condition in the loop node of the iteration; two <empty> activities nested within the <while> activity to represent input and output nodes in the loop body of the iteration; vii. feature: receive event; pattern mapping: a <pick> activity containing <onMessage> structures to define events accepted by the <pick> activity, corresponding to events defined in the receive event; viii. feature: compensation; pattern mapping: a <compensationHandler> structure comprising an activity within the structure to compensate an execution failure; ix. feature: correlation; pattern mapping: a <correlation> element having a correlation ID defined and referenced by a <correlationSet> element; the <correlation> element being nested within a <receive> activity representing an input node, and within all <pick> activities corresponding to one or more receive event nodes; x. feature: variables; pattern mapping: containers; xi. feature: fault handling; pattern mapping: a <catch> structure containing elements in a fault path if the fault is only thrown once; where the fault is capable of being repeatedly caught and thrown then (a) if thrown internally: a <throw> activity; or (b) if thrown externally: a <reply> activity; and xii. feature: transition condition; pattern mapping: an attribute in a <source> element of a <link> element representing the transition".

In rejecting Claim 8, the Examiner states that Collier teaches a system that allows a user to construct a business process with nodes that include conditionals, send/receive/response actions, and iterations (Collier figures 5, 8 and 11). Applicants urge that even assuming *arguendo* that such assertion is true, such assertion does not establish a teaching or suggestion of *feature and pattern mapping pairs* associated with such Collier nodes – but instead merely alleges nodes without any type of feature mapping characteristics pertaining to such nodes. Thus, Claim 8 has been erroneously rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as the Examiner has failed to properly establish a *prima facie* showing of obviousness, as Claim 8 explicitly recites *feature and pattern mapping pairs*.

With respect to Claim 21 (and similarly for dependent Claim 22), Applicants have amended such claim in accordance with the Specification description at pages 32-33. It is urged that none of the cited references teach or suggest the particular fault characteristics now included in amended Claim 21, which advantageously allows for accommodating many different fault scenarios, such as internal/external faults and support for both synchronous and asynchronous processing (Specification page 34, first paragraph – page 36, first paragraph).

With respect to Claim 23 (and similarly for dependent Claims 24 and 25), Applicants traverse for similar reasons to those given above with respect to Claim 7.

Therefore, the rejection of Claims 1-3, 7, 8, 10-13, 17-19, 21-25 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 has been overcome.

**V. 35 U.S.C. § 103, Obviousness**

Claims 4, 5, 9, 14, 15, 20, 26 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Brisson in view of Lämmel and Collier as applied above, and in further view of Nemer (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0110446). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to Claims 4, 5, 14, 15 and 20, the rejection of these claims is now moot as such claims have been cancelled herewith, without prejudice or disclaimer, as described above.

Applicants initially traverse the rejection of Claims 9, 26 and 27 for similar reasons to those given above regarding their respective independent claims, as the newly cited reference to Nemer does not overcome the teaching/suggestion deficiencies identified hereinabove.

Further with respect to Claim 27, it is urged that none of the cited references teach or suggest the claimed feature of “converting Java snippet nodes, and Java assignment and condition expressions” – nor has the Examiner alleged any such teaching or suggestion. Instead, the Examiner merely alleges that Nemer teaches ‘converting Java into XML code’. Such generalized allegation does not establish a specific teaching or suggestion of the particular aspects of Java conversion that are expressly recited in Claim 27. Thus, it is further urged that Claim 27 has been erroneously rejected as a proper prima facie showing of obviousness has not been established by the Examiner.

Therefore, the rejection of Claims 4, 5, 9, 14, 15, 20, 26 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 has been overcome.

**VI. Conclusion**

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is patentable over the cited references and is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: April 10, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

/Wayne P. Bailey/

Wayne P. Bailey  
Reg. No. 34,289  
Yee & Associates, P.C.  
P.O. Box 802333  
Dallas, TX 75380  
(972) 385-8777  
Attorney for Applicants